



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,091	12/22/2000	Kirk Wayne Bauer JR.	8887.002	6999

23859 7590 03/21/2007  
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.  
SUITE 1000  
999 PEACHTREE STREET  
ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915

EXAMINER
----------

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/742,091

Applicant(s)

BAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara N. Burgess

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14, 17 and 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14, 17 and 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed January 3, 2007. Claims 10-13, 15-16, and 18-20 have been cancelled as requested by Applicant. Claims 1-9, 14, 17 are presented for further examination. Claims 21-29 are presented for initial examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 14, 17, 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anupam et al. (hereinafter "Anupam", US Patent 5,862,330).

As per claims 1, 14, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system and method for a computer network comprising network servers hosting a plurality of network sites, comprising:

- A main server bi-directionally connected to the computer network, the main server containing a cell manager for grouping locations of the network sites into cells (column 2, lines 19-21, 44-45, 47-48, column 3, lines 58-60);
- A plurality of client programs bi-directionally connected to the main server via the

Art Unit: 2157

- Wherein each cell comprises a plurality of network sites associated with an entity, and wherein each network site is identified by a Universal Resource Locator and the network is the Internet (column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 1-17);
- Wherein said main server enables a first one of the client programs connected to a network site in one of the cells to identify a second one of the client programs and to form a session with that second client program that collaboratively browses the network sites of the one cell (column 2, lines 29-33, 56-60, 63-65, column 3, lines 34-41, 50-56, column 4, lines 18-22);
- Wherein the main server stores a location of the network site to which the session is connected (column 3, lines 58-61, column 4, lines 10-12).

As per claim 2, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claim 1, wherein the main server enables a client program connected to a network site in one of the cells to identify at least two additional client programs among the plurality of client programs and to form the session with said additional client programs (column 3, lines 34-41, 63-65, column 4, lines 12-22).

As per claim 3, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claim 1, wherein the client programs in the session follow a session leader (column 4, lines 27-30).

As per claim 4, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claim 1, wherein each client program in the session can communicate with other client programs in the session (column 2, lines 33-35, column 4, lines 30-35).

As per claims 5-6, Anupam further discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claim 3, wherein each client program in the session can communicate with other client programs in other sessions in the one cell (column 5, lines 15-20).

As per claims 8-9, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claims 3 and 14, wherein any client program in the session can act as a session leader (column 4, lines 40-43).

As per claim 17, the method according to claim 14, further comprising:

- Assigning a plurality of network site locations to a cell (column 2, lines 19-21, 44-45, 47-48, column 3, lines 58-60);
- Tracking the first session and a plurality of other sessions in the cell (column 3, lines 20-24, 37-39);
- Informing client programs in the first session of other client programs in the other sessions in the cell (column 3, lines 58-60, column 4, lines 44-46).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 21, Anupam discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the main server receives message information from the first client program and selectively sends that message information to the other client programs in session (column 4, lines 1-15).

As per claim 22, Anupam discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the main server receives message information from the first client program and selectively sends that message information to other client programse in the other sessions in the one cell (column 4, lines 1-15).

As per claim 23, Anupam discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the main server sends information to the first client program regarding an allied user (column 2, lines 60-65).

As per claim 24, Anupam discloses the system of claim 23, wherein the main server receives information to the first client program regarding an allied user (column 2, lines 55-65).

As per claim 25, Anupam discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the entity is at least one of a company, a university, or top-level domain (column 3, lines 57-67).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 26, Anupam discloses the system of claim 25, wherein the plurality of network sites that comprise the one cell are dynamically defined (column 4, lines 18-25).

As per claim 27, Anupam discloses the system of claim 25, wherein the plurality of network sites that comprise the one cell are predefined (column 4, lines 1-15).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam et al. (hereinafter "Anupam", US Patent 5,862,330) in view of Shuang et al. (hereinafter "Shuang", US Patent Publication 2004/0133639 A1).

As per claim 7, Anupam discloses a collaborative browsing system according to claim 1.

Anupam, does not explicitly disclose wherein the main server sends specifically targeted advertisements to at least one client program.

Art Unit: 2157

However, in an analogous art, Shuang discloses client receiving different renderings of the same page. Some examples are webpages with banner ads that can be randomly generated by the server (paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement Shuang's advertisement in Anupam's system in order to show the user a different item or view of the webpage.

As per claim 28, Anupam does not explicitly disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the main server sends advertisements to the first client program that are related to the plurality of network sites comprising the one cell.

However, in an analogous art, Shuang discloses client receiving different renderings of the same page. Some examples are webpages with banner ads that can be randomly generated by the server (paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement Shuang's advertisement in Anupam's system in order to show the user a different item or view of the webpage.

As per claim 29, Anupam discloses the method of claim 17, further comprising the steps of:

Dynamically redefining the plurality of network sites that comprise the cell, wherein the entity is at least one of a company or a university.

However, Anupam does not explicitly disclose:



Art Unit: 2157

Sending advertisements to the first client program and the second client program that are related to the plurality of network sites that define the one cell.

However, in an analogous art, Shuang discloses client receiving different renderings of the same page. Some examples are webpages with banner ads that can be randomly generated by the server (paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement Shuang's advertisement in Anupam's system in order to show the user a different item or view of the webpage.

### ***Response to Arguments***

**The Office notes the following argument(s):**

(a) Anupam does not disclose cell manager for grouping locations of the network sites into cells, wherein each cell comprises a plurality of network sites associated with an entity.

5. Applicant's argument filed has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

**In response to:**

(a) Anupam teaches a collaborative browsing session in which a controller groups websites pertaining to automobiles for viewing by a collaborator. The collaborator views a sequence of URLs stored by the controller on this particular entity (column 4, lines 1-17).

Art Unit: 2157

Therefore, Anupam indeed discloses a cell manager for grouping locations of the network sites into cells, wherein each cell comprises a plurality of network sites associated with an entity.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).


Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara N Burgess  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

March 18, 2007

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100